

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 16-20 are new, while Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, 14, and 15 have been amended. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-15 in an office action dated April 7, 2005 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by USPN 5,793,937 issued to Chura. Without further explanation of the rejection, the Examiner simply notes Chura, col. 12, lines 8-14 and col. 8, line 9.

According to its abstract, Chura is directed to:

A method and system which enables the printing of all pages that an interpreter of a page description language can image at the highest print quality that can be maintained while ensuring that all pages will print regardless of complexity. A memory manager is responsible for allocation of memory for rendering pages and a fallback manager is responsible for handling memory overflow and video underrun exceptions.

The passages noted by the examiner are reproduced as follows:

State 61 is the nominal order construction state where orders are added to the order list by graphics order generation module 33 until the printer language interpreter 25 issues an ENDPG command. When ENDPG occurs, a check is made for a potential video underrun. If it is determined by video underrun predictor 47 that a video underrun condition may exist, then a transition is made to state 63.

Chura, col. 12, lines 8-14.

The graphics subsystem is fundamentally a banding system, which utilizes a set of orders to render a page and some band buffers used to ink the page. The memory managed within the graphics subsystem is a heap which holds orders and some number of band buffers. A minimum of two band buffers are required for any configuration. The graphics memory management module determines the heap size and number of band buffers based upon the configuration (duplex setting, resolution and total memory in the printer.

Chura, col. 8, lines 1-9.

Claims 1-9: Claim 1 is directed to a method for printer processing and recites the following acts:

1. receiving a print designation to print content contained in a personal imaging repository;
2. constructing a canvas order for the content;
3. selecting a graphic to send to a printer according to the canvas order;
4. getting graphic data for the selected graphic from the personal imaging repository; and
5. sending the graphic data for printer processing.

Chura mentions nothing of receiving a print designation to print content contained in a personal imaging repository or constructing a canvas order for the content. Furthermore, Chura fails to teach selecting a graphic to send to a printer according to the canvas order and then getting graphic data for the selected graphic from the personal imaging repository.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Chura as are Claims 2-9 which depend from Claim 1. Should the Examiner persist, the Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to specifically identify passages in Chura that teach these acts.

Claims 10-14: Claim 10 is directed to a system for printer processing and recites the following elements:

1. a first component for receiving a print designation to print content contained in a personal imaging repository;
2. a second component for constructing a canvas order;
3. a third component for selecting a graphic to send to a printer according to the canvas order;
4. a fourth component for getting graphic data for the selected graphic from the personal imaging repository; and

5. a fifth component for sending the graphic data for printer processing.

Chura mentions nothing of a component for receiving a designation to print content contained in a personal imaging repository or a component for constructing a canvas order for the content. Furthermore, Chura fails to teach a component for selecting a graphic to send to a printer according to the canvas order and a component for getting graphic data for the selected graphic from the personal imaging repository.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Chura as are Claims 11-14 which depend from Claim 10. Should the Examiner persist, the Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to specifically identify passages in Chura that teach these elements.

Claims 15-20: Claim 15 is directed to a program product having computer executable code for implementing the method of Claim 1. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over Chura, so are Claim 15 and Claims 16-20 which depend from Claim 15.

Claims 1-20 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell Simpson

By



Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

June 29, 2005